

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
FLORENCE DIVISION

CHRISTOPHER JAMES ROGERS,

Plaintiff,

vs.

MICHAEL J. ASTRUE, COMMISSIONER)
OF SOCIAL SECURITY,)

Defendant.)

Civil Action No. 4:10-3127-TLW-TER

ORDER

Plaintiff brought this action pursuant to 205(g) of the Social Security Act, as amended, 42 U.S.C. § 405(g), to obtain judicial review of a final decision of the Defendant, Commissioner of Social Security, denying his claim for disability benefits and supplemental security income. This matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“the Report”) filed by United States Magistrate Judge Thomas E. Rogers, III, to whom this case had previously been assigned pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2)(a), (D.S.C.). In the Report, the Magistrate Judge recommends that the decision of the Commissioner be affirmed. (Doc. # 14). Objections were due on November 21, 2011. The Plaintiff has filed no objections.

This Court is charged with conducting a de novo review of any portion of the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained in that Report. 28 U.S.C. § 636. In the absence of objections to the Report of the Magistrate Judge, this Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

The Court has carefully reviewed the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation and the submitted record. For the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, it is hereby **ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation is **ACCEPTED**. (Doc. # 14). The Commissioner's decision is therefore **AFFIRMED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Terry L. Wooten
United States District Judge

December 15, 2011
Florence, South Carolina